

**REMARKS**

The indication of allowance of claims 3, 6-20, 27-35, 37 and 38 and the indication of allowability of claims 21-26 are acknowledged and appreciated. Accordingly, claim 21 has been rewritten into independent form. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Saito et al.. Claim 1 is independent. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part, “first and second circuit blocks provided on a *single* semiconductor chip ...; and a timing adjustment circuit block provided *on the semiconductor chip, between the first and second circuit blocks*” (emphasis added). Support for this feature can be found, for example, on page 1, line 5; page 11, lines 4-7, and Figure 1 of Applicants’ specification. In direct contrast, the alleged timing circuit of Saito et al. which connects between two *different* semiconductor integrated circuits (i.e., chips) is provided *in one of the two integrated circuits* (see, e.g., Figure 4 and col. 6, lines 57-61). Indeed, signal timing between circuit blocks *in a single chip* is conventionally adjusted by chip design and set *during the design/evaluating process of the chip*. In this regard, Saito et al. is completely silent as to providing a circuit block for adjusting signal timing on a single chip.

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed, either expressly or inherently (noting that “inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities”, *Scaltech Inc. v. Retec/Tetra*, 178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999)), in a single prior art reference, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986), based on the forgoing, it is submitted that Saito et al. does not anticipate claim 1, nor any claim dependent thereon.

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claim 1 is patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also patentable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number shown below. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

  
Ramyar M. Farid  
Registration No. 46,692

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 RMF:men  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: December 7, 2005**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277 as  
our correspondence address.**